



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to read a paper on the subject some other evening, when the points to which his attention had been directed would be noticed. He stated that there were scarcely any Norwegians in Stockholm, consequently he had no opportunity of measuring the skulls of that people, but his impression was that they were not brachycephalic. Neither were the modern Swedes extremely so, but they were so to a moderate extent. There were about 500 Swedish skulls in the Scandinavian museum, and not more than five of them were brachycephalic.

*On the Great Race-Elements in Christianity.* By the Rev. DUNBAR I. HEATH.

The principal divisions into which I propose dividing the subject matter of this essay are, the area in which Christianity has maintained itself in existence; the agents by whose activity it was originally propagated; the principles, moral, social, and intellectual, which it has asserted; and the imagery in which it has clothed and ornamented itself, too often, indeed, forgetting the value of this imagery as mere clothes, but not unmindful of the fact that the mass of mankind will follow after a well dressed principle, no less than a well dressed gentleman or lady.

Now, whatever may be the results at which I may arrive under these several divisions, and whether or not I may succeed in showing that a religion, which has been considered as essentially Semite, is, in fact, hardly Semite at all, I must at the outset protest that I am in search simply and solely of anthropological facts. If it shall turn out to be a fact, that the great Aryan race, the present possessors of Christianity, have received that religion at the hands of Semites, we shall admit such fact with wonderment, as the strongest known instance of the "sic vos non vobis" principle. Even as receiving wool from sheep, and eggs from hens, we are obliged to deprive these animals of that which does not reproduce itself by our taking it, so it would appear that, if we English, French, Greeks, Latins, Russians, etc., have really taken this religion from the Semites, there is none of it left for the original possessors. Such a fact, if established, would be a fact in man's nature or historical development. It would be a fact of anthropology. And if, on the other hand, the principles, the propagators, or the imagery of this religion should be Aryan, the anthropologist who establishes this to the satisfaction of his fellow students, will have established a fact of very great value, but a fact strictly within the domain of his science.

That the area now actually covered by Christianity is within that of Aryanism is no new remark, and I shall spend but little time or space in enforcing it. Here and there we may have a few outsiders, such as the Copts; but this apparently exceptional case of the Copts, seems not so in reality. Here we have a small outlying non-Aryan people embracing and retaining a sort of Christianity. Why so? Because, just at that part of the world, there happened to be a non-Aryan principle strongly developed into practice. Egypt swarmed with solitary devotional, idle, demasculated hermits; and there is nothing in the Aryan heart which nods substantial or even partial approval of the system

which won the Copts. The Copts, just outside the Aryan area, became Christians, because the Christians just in those parts were not in accordance with Aryanism. If this be so, the exception will prove the rule. The rule asserted is, that Aryan principles caused or preceded the reception of the Christian religion. The apparent exception is, that the Copts, having no preceding Aryan principles, yet received the Christian religion; and the explanation is, that the Christianity in vogue just in that part of the world, at that time, was not the Aryan Christianity which the rest of the Christians have consented permanently to receive, and under which they have flourished; while the Copts meanwhile have dwindled down to a mere handful of individuals, whom I only mention lest it should appear I wish to omit facts which might tell against me.

On the same principle on which I have mentioned the Copts, I note that I am aware of conversions in Paraguay, the South Sea Islands, China, India, and elsewhere, which may have more or less of vitality in them; but I have no doubt even the active agents in these conversions will admit that, when an anthropologist talks of a nation accepting Christianity, he means to contemplate a permanent reception, not propped up by the influence of foreign superior civilised missionaries. Among Aryans and their dependants, as, for instance, along the northern coast of Africa, Christianity maintained itself for even hundreds of years; but, the area of those parts being now no longer Aryan, the religion is no longer Christian. Armenia, on the other hand, and Georgia, being Aryan, are Christian. Hungary, it may be said, and the Basque provinces, with the Finns and Lapland, are not Aryan; but in the first place these small outlying tribes would weigh but little against the vast mass of Christian Aryans establishing the rule; then, again, for my own part, I am not moved by the apparent exception of the Basques, Finns, and Lapps, for it is to be remembered that I consider Europe was once inhabited by mute races, kindred in blood, and therefore in principles; and that those who happened to learn their languages from Turanian teachers, are not therefore necessarily alien in race or principles from those who accepted the Aryan language, modified by Grimm's law in different localities. The general co-existence, therefore, of the areas of Aryanism and Christianity I consider self-evident; and I pass now to the consideration of those apostolic personages by whose activity the religion was originally propagated.

From the evidence of the historical parts of the New Testament, supplemented by the earliest works of the Fathers, together with early liturgies, and circular letters among the Churches, it seems abundantly clear that four principal agents, whom we now call Apostles, were concerned in this mighty work. The claim of St. Paul to the title of Apostle was, indeed, denied by the Hebrew party in the Church of that day, and, in the sense that he was not one of the twelve, they were of course historically correct; but in the sense that SS. Peter, James, Paul, and John were the four principal propagators of early Christianity, there is in these days no dispute.

Now, if I admit that Peter, James, and John were Semites in race

and principles, and the advocates and active agents of a substantially Semitic view of religion, I am apparently giving up three-fourths of Christianity to the domain of Semitism, so far as the ideas of its earliest advocates can be taken as evidence of what the religion was. These apparent deductions, however, from the premises, I take to be fallacious; for, whether these three Semites laboured among their fellow Semites or among Aryans, whether their churches in Judæa, Smyrna, Philadelphia, Thyatira, Pergamos, and so on, were Semite churches or not, in either case this work of theirs has geographically and nationally vanished. Even if they preached among Aryans, still the actual localities in which they laboured are not now numbered among those localities where Christianity has maintained itself. What the number of the Christian Jews may have been, and whether they gradually intermarried and amalgamated with the Aryans, or whether their descendants gradually returned to the ancestral form of the Semite religion, it is hard to say; but it is not hard to say that the Semitic churches took no lasting root among their compatriots. If, then, I should allow that the Semite elements in early Christianity were even strenuously advocated by the earliest preachers; if I allow that those preachers claimed the peculiar privilege and advantage of intimate communication with the founder; if the character of their Semite converts was and is marked by a peculiar tenacity in these matters; and if, notwithstanding these advantages for Semitism, there are now no Semite churches in existence worth speaking of, the real deduction is that the Semitic principles of the propagators have not determined those of the religion itself. If, notwithstanding the peculiar advantages possessed by Peter, James, and John, there are now no Christian communities worth speaking of in the localities where they laboured, or among the race of men to whom they belonged; if these men, being Semites, did not substantially and lastingly convert Semites, we may suspect at once that the principles of their young community cannot have been truly Semite, else the Semites would have accepted them. What I hope presently to show is, that Aryan principles were widely spread among the Hellenistic Jews at the time of the origin of the substantially Aryan religion called by the Aryan name of Christianity. Semitism and Aryanism each had their chance; and the failure of these Semite apostles to originate a Semitic church, is a proof, in fact, that Christianity never was Semitic.

The fourth apostle was St. Paul. That he was a Hebrew by birth we need not doubt; but the large-minded gentleman of Tarsus would in his surrounding circumstances differ as much from the small-minded fishermen of Galilee, as a modern Rothschild from an ancient Essene or Ebionite. I admit that this great teacher was successful. In other words, I admit that he founded certain Aryan churches, which have maintained themselves nationally and geographically till this day. If, then, the principles of St. Paul were substantially Semitic, we must admit the general opinion to be correct, that the Aryan people, at a definite period in their development, accepted from strangers a substantially Semitic religion. But if, on the other

hand, St. Paul's principles were substantially Aryan, his nationality is immaterial.

The geographical and racial area now covered by Christianity, and the nationality of the first promulgators of the religion, are divisions of my subject of far less importance than those to which I now proceed to direct attention. But, before I leave this part of the subject, I pause to state why, in alluding to the four apostles, I have taken no notice of the Founder himself. I take this course, partly because those who profess to reverence most deeply the character represented to us as that of the Founder, have been forced to recognise that it is non-racial. Its universality is preached as its excellence. In it there is said to be no preponderance of any of the partial elements of male or female, Jew or Greek, slave or freeman. It may, indeed, be said that this view of his character is derived to us only through St. Paul, and is opposed by the writings attributed to the Semite apostles. In morals such a view of character corresponds, indeed, to pantheism in physics. It recognises the good in the characters of all races and both sexes, just as pantheism recognises the orderly in all nature. Such a view is no doubt essentially Aryan ; but what I am concerned with here, is to point out that, in the face of it, I may not attribute national deep-seated characteristics to one in whom his Aryan followers are agreed to recognise none.

Another obvious reason why I discuss the work of his apostles only is, that they alone were the translators of his language. The actual words used by him are quite unknown ; and it is therefore a matter not of choice, but of necessity, to take his teaching at second hand.

And thus am I now arrived at the important question, whether the moral, social, and intellectual principles of Christianity are Semitic or Aryan.

It will be obvious that I can only enumerate a few of the greater principles which we agglutinate under the name of Christianity, nor need I be too careful as to the accuracy of distinction between moral and social. If I name those elements which strike me as most essential and vital in Christianity, and endeavour honestly to classify them according to their Semite or Aryan affinities, I shall have done what I have proposed to myself to do.

Now that Christianity, in the heart of the world, is more than mere benevolence, more than justice, more than piety, more than a hope of what is, in such strong Aryan imagery, called "going to heaven", and that it is in great degree a personal sympathy with Jesus Christ, I cannot deny as a fact ; and the origin of such sympathy, whether it be Semitic or Aryan, I take to be equivalent with the origin of Christianity.

If this sympathy, then, with such an one as Jesus the Christ be Aryan ; if all Aryan mythologies are based on it ; if there be nothing similar to it in any known Semitic mythology, and no trace of it at all in the way the early Jews regarded their Jehovah, then is the central feeling Aryan which prompts men to be Christians. What, then, was the simple preaching which so mightily moved mankind ? Undeniably, it was the story of one who did nothing but good works,

and said nothing but the utterance of a good spirit, but who incurred by such speech and action the wrath of the constituted authorities. By them he was, in their usual course of law, condemned, and to all outward appearance conquered ; but returning victorious from death, he reasserts his own superiority, reassures his followers, and secures the ultimate triumph of individuals over societies, and consciences over laws.

Now I need not waste time in showing that all Aryan mythologies delight in depicting the descent of Gods upon the earth to combat evil. Nor is it, I think, unknown that the true Aryan spirit considers law to be an evil, and supports the rights of conscience, not only as the Jew did, against the heathen foreigner, but, as no true Semite would do, against his own government and his own priest.

By Semites, we mean the Arab, Assyrian, and Jewish races, with their offshoots ; and I am not aware that in any legend, tradition, or sacred book of any of these races, there is any trace of the conception of a deity appearing on the earth to combat moral evil, succumbing to it for a while, and finally triumphing. The God of the Hebrew Abraham, the God of the Hebrew six days' creation, the God of the Semitic Job, the God of the Satan of the Book of Chronicles, is clearly no such a God. Nor am I aware that there was ever any conception at all among the Jews, before the days of the Alexandrian or Greek philosophy, of a God incarnate in a man, in animals, or in nature.

That on the other hand all Aryan legends were full of each of these conceptions, that of Gods incarnate, and that of Gods combating evil, enslaved to it for a while, and finally triumphing, is so well known that I need not quote examples.

It is admitted that at the time of the origin of Christianity large Semite and Aryan populations were in existence, each of them highly civilised, each of them so circumstanced as to be ready as an audience to hear, to receive, or to reject the new religion. Had the religion been a Semitic one, both its geographical origin and the nationality of its earliest preachers would have favoured its reception by that race, but the stubborn fact is that the new religion depreciated law, depreciated constituted authorities, recognised an incarnation, recognised a God becoming, in strong Aryan language, "a slave to sin," recognised that the recognised law courts could be wrong, and the crucified defendant could be right. The historical success of Christianity is undoubtedly due to the historical sympathy with Christ, and the sympathy with Christ was an Aryan sympathy with the defendant. It is so still. Each poor battered combatant in the struggle for existence considers the world to be banded against him. Let them rave, he says, let them despise me, let them ruin me. They raved against Jesus. He overcame the world. The Aryans and Semites are doubly opposed to each other, and in each respect Christianity is Aryan. The Aryan appreciates order in the physical world, and individuality in the moral or social world of mankind, but the Semite recognises interference or disorder in the physical world, and authority or constituted order, as he calls it, in the moral world. Where in the whole range of Jewish history, previous to their contact with Aryans,

do we find the slightest appreciation of the moral contest of individuals against evil. Begin with Abraham. Nothing of the kind. Family happiness, emigration, prosperity, great expectations, polygamy, willingness to take his son's life, unwillingness to protect his wife's honour—such is Semitism. Compare it with the individualism of St. Paul, the preacher of the new religion, who said, though *an angel from heaven* preach different from me, *let him be accursed*. Abraham incurred no wrath of any constituted authorities, struggled in no life-consuming works for man like Aryan Hercules, but represented the great Jewish principle of prosperity. The prosperity of Moses is equally prominent, whether as adopted in infancy by royalty, nursed in luxury and learning at mid-age, or as leader of 600,000 fighting men in a political revolution. I will not waste time by going through the history of Samson, Jephthah, or David; nowhere was there any contest against constituted authority, upon which moral contest Christianity is based, and to suppose that a true Jew could have been willing to curse an angel from heaven, would be to suppose that he disavowed the theocracy or first principle on which his national life was based.

Christianity, in its origin, was a mighty strengthening to myriads of suffering individuals in their struggles against powers and authorities around them and within them. Semitism decapitates or strikes down rulers physically, but substitutes a successor, and knows of no moral rebellion against the principle of power. The Aryan, incredible as it may seem to some of us even now, can imagine and does really more or less strive after a world without a government. The reason he can do so is doubtless that from early times he has been a monogamist, and that he has, therefore, seen with his own eyes millions of families who exist amicably in faith without law and without government. The race which from early days has been polygamist, requires power and law for the purposes of order. The Aryans, though still in the present day requiring a certain amount of law, can at least conceive and aspire after order without law which St. Paul so vehemently set before them.

Many theories might be invented to explain the apparently surprising fact that the Aryans 1,800 years ago accepted a Semitic religion, but up till the present day the world can hardly be said to have studied anthropology, and it has, therefore, not seen how surprising, how unparalleled, and how naturally impossible such a racial phenomenon would have been, had it in reality occurred. When, however, men's attention is once drawn to the existence of the deep racial furrows on the aggregate brain of humanity, when we see, for instance, that a man of one race differs as much from a man of another, as he does from a woman of his own, I ask why any one should wish to suppose that Christianity is Semite unless it really is so? Do Christians or do they not accept the dictum that in their Christ there is neither male nor female, Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free; in other words, that the distinguishing virtues and characteristics of men and women, Semites, Aryans, Allophylans, Federals and Confederates are all to find their place in a united humanity. If they do, let them become

anthropologists, and give their best attention to the subject of this paper ; and if they do not, then they make their Christ to be a Semite, they make their God who created Aryans to be a Semite or favourer of Semites in the struggle for existence ; they fall, in fact, into arrant one-sided absurdities, they encourage, provoke, and propagate infidelity, they disavow the actual, deny the true, and localise the absolute.

Now, if a Christian anthropologist admits fully to himself that the founder of his religion had no racial preferences, his difficulty in struggling with the question whether Christianity was really of Semite origin would be as follows :—The founder did deeds highly approved of and considered noble by Aryan instinct. These deeds are highly disapproved of, on the contrary, by Semites, and by them attributed to an anarchical, self-seeking, impure, unmanlike spirit. To assert practically that in a matter of opinion, sentiment, moral judgment, or intellectual perception, a defendant standing alone can be right, and the combined authority of Church and State can be wrong, is so monstrous to the prosperous acquiescent Semite, so vivifying to the ever struggling, ever grumbling Aryan, that the former race named Jesus at once a devil, the latter name him still a God. To the one he has been a savour of death unto death, for they are dead, and to the other, so far as Semite principles have allowed it, he has been a savour of life unto life, for they still live.

That there are certain precepts and principles of Semitic aspect written down in the sacred books of Christianity for the acceptance of Christians may not be denied, but if the Aryans have passed them all by with merely nominal recognition, and have built up systems of society on principles opposed to them, it follows simply that the Semite teachers, whether we call them Peter, James and Matthew, or whether we mean the inspirer of Peter, James and Matthew, were respectfully listened to, and their precepts recorded in documents, but it does not follow that the Aryans received their Christianity from Semites. Among the distinguishing and prominent characteristics, for instance, of Aryan populations is the predilection for building large barns when the small ones are full, and for saying to their souls—“Soul, soul, thou hast much good laid up for many years, eat, drink and be merry.” The Aryans also, without apology, care for the things of the morrow, and despise very heartily those low races, or shabby members of a high one, which consider the evil of each day sufficient for it. Among the Aryans the poor are not blessed. In other words Aryan precepts in the sacred books are appreciated and followed, while Semitic precepts are read out in public on Sundays, but leave not the shadow of a trace of any influence on public week-day action. The explanation usually given for this phenomenon is that the human heart is evil and refuses to accept these essentially good precepts. But the anthropologist finds that the Semitic heart does accept them, and for that very reason incurs the contempt of the Aryans, who deny practically that the precepts are really good ones.

These Semitic precepts had a fair trial. The early Semite Christians lived in common. No one said that anything he had was his



own—none of them heaped up treasures upon earth. All that believed sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need. Side by side with these precepts St. Paul was telling Christians not to be slothful in business, and that no one had a right to eat without working. These latter precepts the Aryans have followed; the former they have rejected. St. Paul over and over again tells us that he got his religion from no one, neither was he taught it, but had it by direct revelation. On the one side the Christians had the precept to take no thought for the morrow, for the morrow should take thought for the things of itself; and on the other side St. Paul told how there came upon him daily, the care of all the churches—his flesh, he said, had no rest, but he was troubled on every side, without were fightings, within were fears. Aryan and Semite teachers then took out Aryan and Semite teachings. The result being Aryan, it cannot be truly said that Christianity in the present acceptance of the term is derived to us from Semitic sources.

The same choice which Christians have had between Semitic and Aryan precepts they have also had between Semitic and Aryan doctrines of the most fundamental character, and the result has been equally characteristic. That the Semite conception of the deity, for instance, is to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures is self-evident, and that the Septuagint or Greek conception, where it differs from the Hebrew, must differ by being Aryanised, is no less so. Now Christians have unanimously and completely rejected the Hebrew and accepted the Septuagint conception. They reject the Semitic Hebrew teaching that God is a Being capable of being seen by the human eye, and, rightly or wrongly, they accept the Aryan view, that he is an invisible incomprehensible source of a spirit pervading humanity. The fundamental difference here is enormous, but the anthropological fact is undoubted. The Semite wrote, and the English are still forced by acts of parliament to hear read out to them in churches, that Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone. Also they saw God, and did eat and drink. The Greek translators of this passage took a long step against Semitism when they altered this passage into a statement that the elders saw the place where the God of Israel had stood, and they were seen in the place of God, and did eat and drink. Traces of the same difference of racial sentiment are very visible in other parts of the two versions. In the one, for instance, Hezekiah in his sickness is made to say, "I shall not see Jehovah, even the Lord, in the land of the living." This is altered by the Aryan into, "I shall not see the salvation of God in the land of the living." So again in the famous Semitic passage of Job, we have it, "In my flesh shall I see God whom I shall see for myself, and mine eye shall behold, and not another." Here the systematic racial antipathy of the Septuagint writers betrays itself in their rendering it. "These things have been established for me by God, which things I know for myself, and my eyes have seen them and not another;" and lastly, we may compare the two versions of the well-known passage in Isaiah:—"Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is

given, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father." This in the Septuagint becomes, "His name shall be called the Angel of the Great Council."

These few instances will suffice to show us that when even a Semite preacher of even the most Semitic aspect of nascent Christianity had occasion in his missionary operations to quote the Scriptures, he was obliged, whether he knew it or not, to diffuse a considerable amount of Aryanism, for the Septuagint is well known to have been in those days the only people's edition of the Bible. Now with the Septuagint went a large body of strongly anti-Semite literature, such as the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Daniel, and in this latter Aryan book we have the great source of all the ideas, the imagery, and the phraseology of what in Europe now at the present day is called Christianity.

It is admitted on all hands that the Book of Daniel never was considered by the Jews as part of the canonical scriptures, and it is, therefore, a contradiction in terms to suppose that Christianity could have put Daniel into the Bible, and also could have been a Semitic religion. By the Semite doctrine we surely mean the doctrine of the Hebrew Scriptures, and if Christianity is the doctrine of the Book of Daniel, and Daniel never was in those Hebrew Scriptures, Christianity was not purely Semite in origin. If there is anything more certain than the rest in the life and preaching of Jesus, it is that he gave the whole weight of his authority to this Book of Daniel, and the acceptance of Jesus has been the acceptance of Daniel with all his imagery, his angels, his son of man, his kingdom of heaven, and all the rest of his Aryanism.

To escape from the glaring consequences of the fact that Daniel was not recognised by the Jews, and that he was, on the contrary, the prime minister of the great Aryan propagandist, Darius Hystaspes, men have invented an extra Darius, for whom, however, the chronology of those days can find no place. There is the same close connection in imagery and essential doctrine between Daniel, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Enoch, and the New Testament on one side with the Zend Avesta on the other, as there is historically between Daniel and the mighty Aryan who said, "I make a decree that in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel, for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end."

Taking it as granted that the Book of Enoch was written after Daniel, and before Christianity, I might fill pages with characteristic extracts bearing out what I have said of it, that all the most peculiar imagery of the New Testament is derived therefrom. I will content myself with the following from chapter 48 :—

"In that place I beheld a fountain of righteousness which never failed, encircled by many springs of wisdom. Of these all the thirsty drank, and were filled with wisdom, having their habitation with the righteous, the elect, and the holy. In that hour was this Son of Man invoked before the Lord of Spirits, and his name in the presence of the Ancient of Days. Before the sun and the signs were created,

before the stars of heaven were formed, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. A support shall be for the righteous and the holy to lean upon, without falling, and he shall be the light of nations. He shall be the hope of those whose hearts are troubled. All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him; shall bless and glorify him, and sing praises to the name of the Lord of Spirits."

The advocate of the common view that Christianity is a Semite religion, accepted by the Aryans from the hand of the Semites, must explain this and scores of similar passages in a book quoted by St. Jude himself. The ideas here are those of Righteousness, Wisdom, Son of Man, Lord of Spirits, Light of Nations. They connect us with the Book of Wisdom, the Book of Daniel, and the Zend Avesta. Yet they are the very inmost ideas of Christianity. How is this? Simply because the great majority of the earliest preachers of Christianity were Hellenists. This fact is historically known, and were it not so the development of the doctrine of the Trinity among Christians would of itself be sufficient to show the great weight of the Aryan element in those days, for surely no conceivable doctrine could be picked out more alien to every instinct of the Semites.

Christianity then being the religion of one who was condemned by society, who considered society to be wrong and himself to be right, is a religion acceptable to Aryans. Christianity being a religion recognising that the principle of faith or mutual trust is far preferable to the dead hard power of law for the purpose of sustaining justice or order in the human race, is a religion acceptable to Aryans. Christianity recognising care, labour, anxiety, industry, and forethought, as necessary in a contest which it recognises as going on between good and evil, is a religion acceptable to Aryans. Christianity being the religion of the Book of Daniel more than of all the rest of the Old Testament put together, which Book of Daniel never was part of the Hebrew Bible, is a religion derived principally from Aryan sources. And finally, Christianity being professed by Aryans now, and not being professed by Semites now, and having at its origin been preached and propagated in Greek, and its records having been written in Greek, is in a fair and full sense of the word a truly Aryan religion.

The Rev. Dr. IRONS hoped an opportunity would be given for considering the paper more deliberately, for it touched on so many important points that it was impossible in merely hearing it read to discuss them properly. He would ask, however, what it was the author of the paper intended by the distinction he would draw between the Aryan and the Semitic races. Was it that Christianity was an Aryan religion and not Semitic? He could not see what would be gained by the admission that it was so, if made. What then? Would he tell the meeting what then? On what ground was it that he assumed that the Book of Daniel was the source whence Christianity derived its ideas? Such assumptions as that ought not to be lightly made.

Mr. BOLLAERT said that having lived a great many years among the Indians of South America, he was able to form an opinion as to the

effect of the attempts to spread Christianity among them, and he felt convinced that Christianity had no vitality among the pure Indian population. A great deal of trouble had been taken by the missionaries, but they had only succeeded in giving these people a love of the forms and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, and had not inculcated among them Christian principles. The Indians had not the intellect to understand Christianity as Mr. Bollaert understood it. He spoke only of the aboriginal population of South America, of Mexico, Central America, and Peru more particularly, and among them Christianity had no vitality whatever.

Mr. PIKE said it was not the province of that Society to consider whether the Book of Daniel was authentic or not, and he objected to such questions being brought before them. He objected also to the classification of the races of men into Aryan and Semite.

The Rev. DUNBAR HEATH, in explanation, said he only used the words that had been introduced by others; it was immaterial to him what they were called.

Mr. PIKE, in continuation, observed that Mr. Heath, at all events, drew a marked distinction between them. He said that the Semites recognise divine interference in the physical world while the Aryans did not. Now, whether or not we are Aryans, we professed to be Christians, and certainly in the prayer-book of the Church there are several instances of supplications for divine interference. There were prayers for the sick, and on special occasions for individuals, and there had recently been special prayers for the removal of the cattle plague. It might, indeed, be replied by Mr. Heath that such prayers had not entered into the hearts of the people; but the same recognition of divine interference also occurs out of the church. At coroners' inquests, for instance, the verdicts of the jury were often "Died by the visitation of God." There were many differences among Christians respecting the doctrines of Christianity, and it would be difficult to say which was the Aryan belief and which the Semite. Some Christians, for example, believed in the atonement. That belief was quite as much Semitic as it was Aryan. Then again, what was said in the paper about one race believing in a visible and the other in an invisible God seemed like an inversion of the fact. Moses was stated to have seen the back part of God, and did the Aryans not suppose they have seen God? They profess, indeed, to have seen more Gods than any other race. In the *Iliad* the Gods are represented as continually coming down to assist in battle; in Roman history are there not Castor and Pollux? and in the dramas of the middle ages there were frequent representations of God and Christ.

Major OWEN entered at some length into a consideration of the biblical part of the question, introduced in the paper, and pointed out the difference in the teachings of Paul and Peter, between whom he said an antagonistic feeling existed. He agreed with Mr. Heath that the Book of Daniel was not recognised by the Jews, who assert that as an eunuch, Daniel could not have been dedicated to Jehovah, and that his writings contain the imagery found in the New Testament. He then proceeded to show the importance attached by

Christians to the prophecies of Daniel, whose profession was avowedly that of an astrologer, and remarked on the coincidence that the rules by which astrologers predict events by the motions of the planets, and the interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel, by Dr. Cumming and other Christian divines, agree in pointing to the year 1866, or rather 1867, as a time at which Rome should lose power, and Jerusalem become of importance, or as it is commonly termed, the coming of the millennium.

Mr. CARTER BLAKE said that Mr. Heath, in his paper, attempted to carry out the application of two axioms, that history is part of anthropology, and that history is worthless. For notwithstanding the works of certain apostles of Christianity, he said they failed to make permanent converts, therefore Mr. Heath thought they were Semites, and their failure was owing to their race character. But how had he proved that they were Semites, and how had he proved that their mission was not successful? History recorded it as a fact that there was a church called Christian founded by the apostle James at Jerusalem; and that community exercised some influence not only on the Greek proselytes and afterwards on Alexandrian teachers, but on the Christians of the east, by whom the church founded by James was much prized. The apostle John, we were informed, founded a thriving church at Ephesus, which was brought into connection with both Aryans and Semites. St. Peter, also, at Rome founded a Christian Church, which consisted not only of pure Aryans, but of populations of various kinds. Whatever interpretation was given to these facts, it could not be denied that the Christian organisations then founded had continued to the present time. He was surprised, therefore, that Mr. Heath should say that no Christian communities were established at Rome, in Asia Minor or other places in the east; nor did he think that, prior to this new revelation, we were in the habit of believing that the apostles had no success in propagating Christianity. Some of them, it was known, exercised influence over the Ethiopians, who in the early history of the church had a workable organisation. They had liturgies in their churches, and those Christians exercised a far wider influence over neighbouring Nigritian populations, than those of Aryan or Semitic races. Christianity, he believed, was much more widely distributed in those early ages than Mr. Heath represented.

Dr. CHARNOCK said it might be worth while to estimate the number of the "small outlying exceptions" to the proposition laid down by the author of the paper. They would probably amount to between nine and ten millions. There were 350,000 Basques, 150,000 Copts, 2,000,000 Armenians, 400,000 Georgians, 1,500,000 Finns, 60,000 Lapps, and 5,500,000 Magyars. It was impossible, indeed, that the Georgians and Armenians might not come within the exception in question. Before the time of Alexander the Great, Georgia formed a part of Armenia, and the Armenians claimed descent from Togarmah, son of Gomer, and they probably knew as much about the matter as anybody else. With regard to the Copts, the author of the paper stated that they professed only a sort of Christianity. It might be

interesting to know what sort of Christianity it was. In Great Britain alone there were at least 150 different sorts. The Rev. Dunbar Heath seemed to have fallen into a dilemma. His proposition was that only an Aryan race could accept an Aryan religion, that the Turanians of Europe were not so by race, but only by language, and that the Aborigines of Europe were probably mutes. If so, either the Aborigines of Europe were neither Aryans nor Turanians, and being such, accepted an Aryan religion, partly through Aryan, partly through Turanian teachers, or they were Aryans; and if they were Aryans, could they be mutes?

The Rev. DUNBAR HEATH replied to the various remarks on his paper, observing, in the first place, that the spirit of the discussion had been all that could be wished. Dr. Irons had asked what was the tendency of the paper, but he must let the paper speak for itself; for if he had any further views and saw to what his observations tended, a meeting of this Society was not the place to express them. His observations in the paper must be accepted as they were, and he would not say what was the tendency of the opinion that the Book of Daniel had been received in the Christian canon and not in that of the Jews. Mr. Pike had hit him rather hard. He had said that we accept at the present day in Christian churches many of the opinions which in his paper he had ascribed to the Semites, as distinguishing them from the Aryans. There were, no doubt, a vast variety of views taken by different people in this country, and the Semitic and Aryan principles were both struggling for supremacy, with everything else, but the stronger were the principles on which society is based, the better it would bear such a conflict; and in his paper he took merely a broad view of the race character of the people. With regard to the striking remarks of Major Owen, they must stand on their own bottom. They were highly interesting, and not adverse to the opinions expressed in the paper. Mr. Blake had put forward as objections to his views that there are communities of Christians now in Asia Minor, and that there was no evidence as to the nationality of the apostles. With regard to one of the most distinguished of those communities in former times—the church at Ephesus—its present condition certainly bore out fully all he had stated. Ephesus was now only a station of the new railway, and in the place where old Polycarp lived, that railway station is the only house. In parts of Syria, also, there are now very few Christians. As to the nationality of the apostles, it was generally supposed that they were all Jews; and if they were not, that would support his argument. As to the Armenians and Georgians mentioned by Dr. Charnock, he considered them to be Aryans. With regard to the remarks of Mr. Pike, he was aware of the dilemma about the Aryan language being spoken by people not Aryans. He admitted there was a difficulty in the matter, and as he could not explain it, let it be so. He was glad, however, that, on the whole, his views of the difference of appreciation of Christian doctrines by Aryans and Semites had not been disputed, and there seemed to be an accordance with the general sentiments expressed in the paper.